arXiv:1510.00483v1 [math.CT] 2 Oct 2015

A NOTE ON WARPINGS OF MONOIDAL STRUCTURES

DIMITRI CHIKHLADZE

Abstract. In [LS14] the analogy between the Kleisli construction and the construction of "warping a skew monoidale category" in the sense of [LS12] was outlined. In this note we present the same work in a slightly more formal way.

1. Warpings

Fix a bicategory $\mathbb{B}$ as a large ambient. When we talk of objects, morphisms, 2-cells, monads and other concepts we mean those within $\mathbb{B}$. As usual we omit the bicategory structural isomorphisms.

Definition 1.1. A **warping** from a monad (X, B) to an endomorphism $A : X \to X$ consists of 2-cells $t : ABA \Rightarrow AB$ and $k : 1_X \to AB$ satisfying the following equations







A warping is precisely the structure which is needed to define a monad structure on the composite AB which is suitably compatible with the monad (X, B).

Theorem 1.2. *Given a monad (X, B) and an endomorphism $A : X \to X$, there is a one-to-one correspondence between warping structures (t, k) and those monad structures on AB for which $(Ap)(eB) : B \to AB$ is a monoid map; a warping is determined from a monoid structure on AB by*

- $t = p^{AB}(ABAe)$
- $k = e^{AB}$

and conversely, a monad structure on AB is determined by a warping by

- $p^{AB} = (Ap)(tB)$
- $e^{AB} = k$.

Recall from [LS02] that a wreath consists of a monad (X, B), an endofunctor $A : X \to X$, and 2-cells $d : BA \Rightarrow AB$, $q : AAB \Rightarrow AB$, $j : 1_X \Rightarrow AB$ satisfying the following axioms of which the first pair expresses compatibility of d with the monad structure of B, the second pair expresses compatibility of d with q and j, while the last set in a sense represents associativity and unitivity conditions for q and j:













In fact, a wreath is a monad in a certain bicategory $\mathrm{EM}(\mathbb{B})$ (see [LS02]). Recall also, that a wreath between (X, B) and A gives rise to a monad (X, AB) with the monad unit $j : 1 \Rightarrow AB$ and the monad multiplication $(pA)(qp)(AdB) : ABAB \Rightarrow AB$.

Theorem 1.3. *There is a one-to-one correspondence between warpings (t, k) from a monad (X, B) to an endofunctor A and wreaths (d, q, j) between the same two; a wreath is determined from a warping by*

- $d = t(ApA)(kBA)$
- $q = t(AeA)$
- $j = k$

and conversely, a warping is determined from a wreath by

- $t = (Ap)(qB)(Ad)$
- $k = j$.

Example 1.4. Take $\mathbb{B}$ to be the bicategory of spans Span. Its objects are sets, a morphism $M : X \to Y$ in it can be identified with a collection $M(x, y)$ of sets indexed by pairs $(x, y) \in X \times Y$, while its 2-cells $M \Rightarrow M'$ can be identified with families of maps $M(x, y) \to M'(x, y)$. The composition is expressed by the usual matrix multiplication formula

$$MN(x, y) = \coprod_z M(z, y) \times N(x, z).$$

The identity morphism 1_X is the collection of sets indexed by the elements of $X \times X$ consisting of the one-element set on the diagonal and the empty set everywhere else. There is a pseudofunctor $\mathsf{Cat}^{\mathrm{op}} \to \mathsf{Span}$ which is identical on objects, and sends a map $F : X \to Y$ to the span F^* for which $F^*(y, x)$ is the one-element set whenever $Fx = y$ and the empty set otherwise. F^* has a dually defined left adjoint F_*. We have

$$F^*M(z, x) = M(z, Fx)$$

$$NF^*(x, z) = N(Fx, z)$$

from which it follows that, a 2-cell $MF^* \to F^*M$ amounts to a collection of maps $M(x, y) \to M(Fx, Fy)$.

It is a well-known simple fact that a monad (X, B) in Span is a category whose set of object is X, and whose homsets are $B(x, y)$. We use B to stand for this category as well.

A wreath (d, q, j) from (X, B) to T^* within Span is a monad on the category B. The 2-cell d in this case amounts to a family $B(x, y) \to B(Tx, Ty)$, which gives the extension of the function T to a functor on the category B. The 2-cells q and j amount to specifying natural families of morphism $TTx \to x$ and $x \to Tx$ which give T the monad structure.

A warping (t, k) from (X, B) to T^* is an mw-monad on the category B (see [LS14]). The 2-cell t corresponds to a family of functions

$$T : B(x, Ty) \to B(Tx, Ty).$$

The 2-cell k corresponds to specifying morphisms $K_x : x \to Tx$ of B, for each x. The warping axioms then translate to the equations

$$T(Tg \circ f) = Tg \circ Tf$$

$$TK_x = 1_{Tx}$$

$$f = Tf \circ K_x.$$

which are exactly the data and the axioms for an mw-monad.

The construction of Theorem 1.2 is exactly the Kleisli construction for an mw-monad. The Theorem 1.3 recaptures the one-to-one correspondence between monads and mw-monads.

2. Skew monads

Further we will work within the tricategory $\mathbb{C}$. As usual, we will write as if $\mathbb{C}$ were a gray category.

In [LS12] the notion of a *skew monoidale* within a monoidal bicategory was defined. A *skew monad* in a tricategory $\mathbb{C}$ is nothing else but a skew monoidale in the endo-hom monoidal bicategory $\mathbb{C}(X, X)$, for an object X in $\mathbb{C}$. As the notion of skew monoidale is a laxification of the notion of monoid, so the notion of skew monad is a laxification of the notion of monad. More verbosely, a skew monad is similar to a monad except that the identities between 2-cells in the monad axioms are replaced by appropriately directed and suitably coherent structural non-invertible 3-cells.

Definition 2.1. A (left) **skew monad** in $\mathbb{C}$ is defined to be a skew monoidale in the endo-hom monoidal bicategory $\mathbb{C}(X, X)$ of an object X in $\mathbb{C}$; besides the object X it consists of an endomorphism $B : X \to X$, 2-cells $p : BB \Rightarrow B$ and $e : 1_X \Rightarrow B$, a 3-cell called an associator



and 3-cells called left and right unitors



satisfying the following five axioms:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} p(pB)(BpB) & \xRightarrow{\alpha-} & p(Bp)(BpB) & \xRightarrow{-\alpha} & p(Bp)(BBp) \\ {\scriptstyle -\alpha}\uparrow & & & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle \alpha-} \\ p(pB)(pBB) & \xRightarrow[\alpha-]{} & p(Bp)(pBB) & \xRightarrow[\cong]{} & p(pB)(BBp) \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} p(pB)(BeB) & \xRightarrow{\alpha-} & p(Bp)(BeB) \\ {\scriptstyle -\rho}\uparrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle -\lambda} \\ p & \xRightarrow[1]{} & p \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} p(pB)(eBB) & \xRightarrow{-\lambda} & p \\ {\scriptstyle \alpha-}\downarrow & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle \lambda-} \\ p(Bp)(eBB) & \xRightarrow[\cong]{} & p(eB)p \end{array}$$



Example 2.2. Every monoidal bicategory can be considered as a one-object tricategory, whereupon the latter is known as the suspension of the former. Suppose that $\mathbb{C}$ is a suspension of a monoidal bicategory $(\mathcal{V}, \otimes, I)$. Then, by definition, a skew monad in $\mathbb{C}$ is the same as the skew monoidale in $\mathcal{V}$.

Example 2.3. A skew monoidale in the monoidal bicategory $(\mathsf{Cat}, \times, 1)$ is a skew monoidal category of [Sz12]. It follows that a skew monad in the suspension of Cat is a skew monoidal category.

Example 2.4. Consider the tricategory of category-matrices $\mathsf{Mat}(\mathsf{Cat})$ which is a higher dimensional analogue of the bicategory Span described in [Ch15]. Its object are sets. The hom-bicategory $\mathsf{Mat}(\mathsf{Cat})(X, Y)$ is defined to be the 2-category $[X \times Y, \mathsf{Cat}]$. Thus, a morphism $M : X \to Y$ is essentially a collection of small categories $M(x, y)$ indexed by the elements of the product $X \times Y$. The morphisms and 2-cells are given by indexed collections of functors and natural transformations. The horizontal composition is defined by the usual matrix multiplication formula

$$MN(x, y) = \coprod_z M(z, y) \times N(x, z).$$

The identity morphism 1_X is the collection of categories indexed by the elements of $X \times X$ which has the one-object category on the diagonal and the empty category everywhere else. Since its homs are strict 2-categories, $\mathsf{Mat}(\mathsf{Cat})$ is in fact a 2-Cat-enriched bicategory.

A skew monad in $\mathsf{Mat}(\mathsf{Cat})$ is a skew bicategory introduced in [LS14]. Indeed, suppose that $(X, B, p, e, \alpha, \rho, \lambda)$ is a skew monad in $\mathsf{Mat}(\mathsf{Cat})$. Then, X is the set of objects of the skew bicategory. For each pair of element x and y of X, $B(x, y)$ is the hom-category, i.e. its objects are morphisms $x \to y$ of the skew bicategory, and its morphisms are 2-cells between these in the skew bicategory. The 2-cell $p : AA \Rightarrow A$ amount to a family of functors

$$A(z, y) \times A(x, z) \to A(x, y)$$

which sends a pair (g, f) to their composite $g \circ f$. The 2-cell $e : 1_X \Rightarrow A$ amounts to specifying an object 1_x in $A(x, x)$ for each x. The 3-cells

α, ρ and λ correspond to natural transformations whose components are

$$(h \circ g) \circ f \longrightarrow h \circ (g \circ f)$$

$$1 \circ f \longrightarrow f$$

$$f \longrightarrow f \circ 1 \ .$$

These are the non-invertible associator and unitor structural morphisms of the skew bicategory. The axioms of a skew monad translate to the axioms which these structural morphisms are required to satisfy.

Example 2.5. Let $\mathbb{C}$ be the double suspension of a braided monoidal category $(\mathcal{B}, \otimes, i)$. Then, a skew monad with $e = i$ is an *augmented lax tricocycloid* (see [LS12]). The 2-cell p is the underlying object of the lax tricocycloid. The skew associator α determines the fusion operator $p \otimes p \to p \otimes p$. While, the skew unitors λ and ρ provide the *augmentation* which consists of a counit $p \to i$ and a unit $i \to p$.

3. Skew warpings

Just as a skew monad is a laxification of a monad, so a skew warping is a laxification of a warping.

Definition 3.1. A **skew warping** from a monad (X, B) to an endomorphism $A : X \to X$ consists of 2-cells $t : ABA \Rightarrow AB$ and $k : 1_X \Rightarrow AB$ and 3-cells







satisfying the following axioms


t(ApA)(tBA)(ApABA)(tBABA)
t(ApA)(ApBA)(tBBA)(ABtBA)
(Ap)(tB)(ABt)(ApABA)(tBABA)
t(ApA)(ABpA)(tBBA)(ABtBA)
(Ap)(tB)(ApAB)(tBAB)(BABt)
t(ApA)(tBA)(ABApA)(ABtBA)
(Ap)(ApB)(tBB)(ABtB)(ABABt)
(Ap)(tB)(ABt)(ABApA)(ABtBA)
(Ap)(ABp)(tBB)(ABtB)(ABABt)
(Ap)(tB)(ABAp)(ABtB)(ABABt)


(Ap)(tB)(ABt)(ABkA)
(Ap)(tB)(ABAe)
t(ApA)(tBA)(ABkA)
t
(Ap)(ABe)t


t(ApA)(tBA)(kABA)
(Ap)(tB)(ABt)(kABA)
t(ApA)(AeBA)
(Ap)(tB)(kAB)t
t
(Ap)(AeB)t


(Ap)(tB)(ApAB)(tBAB)(ABABk)
(Ap)(ApA)(tBB)(ABtA)(ABABk)
(Ap)(tB)(ABk)(Ap)(tB)
(Ap)(ABp)(tBB)(ABtA)(ABABk)
(Ap)(tB)
(Ap)(tB)(ABp)(ABtA)(ABABk)



Theorem 3.2. *Given a skew warping $(t, k, \nu, \nu_0, \kappa)$ from a monad (X, B) to an endomorphism A, there is a skew monad structure on the composite AB with the skew unit $k : 1_X \Rightarrow AB$, the skew multiplication $(Ap)(tB) : ABAB \Rightarrow AB$, and the skew associator and the skew unitors defined from ν, ν_0 and κ in the straightforward way.*

Example 3.3. Let $\mathbb{C}$ be the suspension of a monoidal bicategory $(\mathcal{V}, \otimes, I)$. By Example 2.2 a skew monad (X, B) in $\mathbb{C}$ is a skew monoidale in $\mathcal{V}$. A warping in our sense from (X, B) to I is essentially the same as the skew warping in the sense of [LS12] on the corresponding monoidale in $\mathcal{V}$.

Example 3.4. Specializing the previous example by taking $\mathcal{V}$ to be the monoidal 2-category Cat, we recapture the notion of warping on a skew monoidal category [LS12].

Example 3.5. Take $\mathbb{C}$ to be the bicategory $\mathsf{Mat}(\mathsf{Cat})$. We have a pseudofunctor $\mathsf{Cat} \to \mathsf{Mat}(\mathsf{Cat})$ which sends a map $F : X \to Y$ to a category matrix F^* for which $F^*(x, y)$ is the one-object category whenever $Fx = y$ and the empty category otherwise. F^* has a dually defined left adjoint F_*. We have

$$F^*M(z, x) = M(z, Fx)$$
$$NF^*(x, z) = N(Fx, z),$$

from which it follows that, a 2-cell $MF^* \to F^*M$ amounts to a collection of functors $M(x, y) \to M(Fx, Fy)$.

By Example 2.4, a skew monad (X, B) in $\mathsf{Mat}(\mathsf{Cat})$ is a skew bicategory, for which we also write B.

A skew warping $(t, k, \nu, \nu_0, \kappa)$ from (X, B) to $T^* : X \to X$ is the same as a skew warping on the skew bicategory B in the sense of [LS14]. T is a map of sets $X \to X$. The 2-cell t amounts to a family of functors

$$T : B(x, Ty) \to B(Tx, Ty),$$

The 2-cell k amounts to specifying a family of objects K_x in $B(x, Tx)$. The 3-cells ν, ν_0 and κ translate to natural transformations with components

$$T(Tg \circ f) \longrightarrow Tg \circ Tf$$
$$TK_x \longrightarrow 1_{Tx}$$

$$f \longrightarrow Tf \circ K_x \ ,$$

which satisfying the axioms of a skew warping on a skew bicategory.

The construction of Theorem 3.2 recaptures the Kleisli construction for a skew warping on a skew bicategory described in Section 5 in [LS14].

Example 3.6. Let $\mathbb{C}$ be a double suspension of a braided monoidal category $(\mathcal{B}, \otimes, i)$. Consider a trivial skew monad, i.e. the one all of whose data consists of identity cells. A warping from the trivial monad to the only morphism of $\mathbb{C}$ with $k = i$ and $j = i$ is essentially the same as an augmented lax tricocycloid with the underlying object q.

4. Algebras

First we consider the bicategorical case. There exists a natural notion of an actee for a warping.

Definition 4.1. An algebra of a warping (t, k) from a monad (X, B) to an endofunctor A in a bicategory $\mathbb{B}$, consists of an object Y of B, a morphism $M : X \to Y$ and a 2-cell $m : MBA \Rightarrow MB$ satisfying the following equalities



Example 4.2. Suppose that (t, k) is a warping from a monad (X, B) to an endomorphism T^* within a bicategory Span. In other words, by Example 1.4, it is an mw-monad on the category B. Suppose that Y is the one-element set, and a is the map $Y \to X$ corresponding to choosing an object a of B. A 2-cell $m : a^*BT^* \to a^*B$ amounts to a family of maps $E : B(z, Ta) \to B(z, a)$. The algebra axioms become the identities

$$E(Eg \circ f) = Tg \circ Ef$$
$$g = Eg \circ K_x$$

where $g : y \to a$ and $f : x \to Ty$. This means that an algebra for the warping is the same as an algebra for the mw-monad T. The latter itself is the same as an algebra for the corresponding usual monad. The usual monad algebra structure is given by the morphism $E1_{Tx} : Tx \to x$.

Now we switch to the tricategorical setting. An algebra of a skew warping is a laxification of an algebra of a warping.

Definition 4.3. An algebra of a skew warping $(t, k, \nu, \nu_0, \kappa)$ from a skew monad (X, B) to an endofunctor A in a tricategory $\mathbb{C}$, consists of an object Y of B, a morphism $M : X \to Y$, a 2-cell $m : MBA \Rightarrow MB$ and 3-cells



coherent in the suitable way.

Example 4.4. Suppose that (X, B) is a skew monad in the tricategory $\mathsf{Mat}(\mathsf{Cat})$, and (t, k) is a skew warping from it to an endofunctor T^*. In other words it is a skew warping on the skew bicategory B. Suppose that Y is the one-element set, and a is the map $Y \to X$ corresponding to choosing an object a of B. A 2-cell $m : a^*BT^* \to a^*B$ amounts to a family of functors $E : B(z, Ta) \to B(Tz, Ta)$. The structural 3-cells of the algebra amount to morphisms

$$E(Eg \circ f) \longrightarrow Tg \circ Ef$$

$$g \longrightarrow Eg \circ K_x$$

where $g : y \to a$ and $f : x \to Ty$, satisfying exactly the axioms of an algebra for a skew warping on a skew bicategory in the sense of [LS14].

References

[Ch15] Dimitri Chikhladze. Lax formal theory of monads, monoidal approach to bicategorical structures and generalized operads. *Theory and Applications of Categories*, 30(10):332–386, 2015. 5

[LS02] Stephen Lack and Ross Street. The formal theory of monads II. *Journal of pure and applied algebra*, 175(1):243–265, 2002. 2

[LS12] Stephen Lack and Ross Street. Skew monoidales, skew warpings and quantum categories. *Theory and Applications of Categories*, 26(15):385–402, 2012. 1, 4, 6, 8

[LS14] Stephen Lack and Ross Street. On monads and warpings. *Cahiers de topologie et géométrie différentielle catégoriques*, XL(4):244–266, 2014. 1, 3, 5, 8, 9, 10

[Sz12] Kornel Szlachányi. Skew-monoidal categories and bialgebroids. *Advances in Mathematics*, 231(3):1694–1730, 2012. 5

E-mail address: d.chikhladze@gmail.com